

## Meeting Notes

### Project 2010-05.2 Special Protection Systems Standard Drafting Team

March 17-19, 2015 | 8:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. CDT

Entergy  
New Orleans, LA

#### Administrative

- Introductions and chair remarks**

Gene Henneberg, the chair, brought the meeting to order on Tuesday, March 17, 2015 and welcomed everyone. Building and safety information/logistics were provided by Sharma Kolluri of Entergy. Each participant was introduced. Those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	In Person	Conference Call/Web
Gene Henneberg	NV Energy / Mid-American	Member	X	
Bobby Jones	Southern Company	Member	X	
Amos Ang	Southern California Edison	Member	X	
Sharma Kolluri	Entergy	Member	X	
Alan Engelmann	ComEd / Exelon	Member	X	
Davis Erwin	Pacific Gas and Electric	Member	X	
Charles-Eric Langlois	Hydro-Quebec TransEnergie	Member	X	
Robert J. O'Keefe	American Electric Power	Member	X	
Hari Singh	Xcel Energy	Member	X	
Al McMeekin	NERC	NERC Staff	X	
Lacey Ourso	NERC	NERC Staff	X	
Milena Yordanova	NERC	NERC Staff	X	
Syed Ahmad	FERC	Observer	X	
Gerry Dunbar	NPCC	Observer	X	
Guy Zito	NPCC	Observer	X	

- **Determination of quorum**

The rule for NERC standard drafting team (SDT or team) states that a quorum requires two-thirds of the voting members of the SDT. Quorum was achieved as 9 of the 10 voting members were present.

- **NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement**

Mr. McMeekin reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public announcement disclaimer.

- **Review team roster**

The team reviewed the roster and confirmed that it was accurate. It was noted that Bill Edwards, NERC staff attorney was leaving NERC. It was also noted that John Ciufo may not be able to continue as a member of the drafting team.

## Agenda Items

### 1. Discussion of SPS Definition

NERC was not able to remove the term SPS from every standard. Some standards have the term SPS only in them. The team discussed two choices:

- a. Do nothing regarding the use of the term SPS in the standards now. Wait for the 5 year review to change them
- b. Change the NERC Glossary definition for SPS to say “see RAS”. This would require an industry vote.

The consensus of the team was for the second option.

### 2. Review and Discuss Assignments

The team discussed whether there was a need for a formal review when a RAS is being retired. Only a very minimal review is made in SERC and RFC today. More is done in the other regions. The team reached consensus on having minimal requirements for reviewing the retirement of a RAS.

The SDT reviewed the revised rationales for each requirement. The rationale for Requirement R6 drove a lot of discussion. Other rationales were reviewed and finalized.

### 3. Continue Standard Development

The team began a review of the whole standard. The Purpose was modified slightly. The PC was deleted from the functional entities because there are no longer any requirements for the PC. The use of the terms “RAS-owner” and “RAS-entity” were discussed at length. It was decided to use “RAS-owner” for some of the requirements and to use “RAS-entity” for other requirements.

The team reviewed all of the requirements and made small wording changes to some of them.

The team then worked on a mapping document to show the correlation between existing requirements in PRC-012, -013, -014, -015 and 016 and the requirements in the new standard.

The team began work on Attachment 1 using Rob O'Keefe's marked-up version. Many wording changes were made to this attachment. The team discussed what is needed to retire a RAS and a decision was made to limit the review to

- Summary of why RAS not needed any longer
- Information for the reviewer to understand the RAS location
- Expected retirement date

Next the team reviewed the Attachment 2 checklist of items for the RAS review. Many wording changes were made to this attachment. The team decided to postpone further discussion of the "redundancy" issue. An item related to having the status of the RAS telemetered to the TOP and RC was deleted.

The team then reviewed Attachment 3 which includes the information required for the RAS database. Only a few minor changes were made.

Much discussion was held regarding RAS classifications and a possible Attachment 4. Rob provided a proposal concerning the aspects of no single component failure and security. It was decided that we need some examples to help us think through the issues. A decision regarding the issue of RAS classifications will be postponed until the next meeting.

Assignments were made for reviewing and revising the technical basis as follows:

R1 – Amos	R4 – Bobby	R7 – Al E.	R10 – Charles
R2 – Rob	R5 – Hari	R8 – Davis	R11 – Charles
R3 – Gene	R6 – Gene	R9 – Jonathan	Att. 1&2 - Gene

#### 4. Next Steps

Schedule a conference call prior to the next face-to-face meeting

#### 5. Future meeting(s)

- a. April 7, 2015 | Ready Talk 2:00 – 4:00 EST
- b. April 14-16, 2015 | Atlanta, GA

#### 6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned on Thursday, March 19, 2015